



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,707	03/27/2006	Mitsunobu Yoshida	1003510-000165	3545
21839 7590 10/02/2008 BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC POST OFFICE BOX 1404 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404				
EXAMINER HARRIS, GARY D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1794				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/02/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/573,707

Applicant(s)

YOSHIDA ET AL.

Examiner

GARY D. HARRIS

Art Unit

1794

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-8 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 9-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/17/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that a lamination comprising a high molecular compound and magnetic thin plates having 0.1 to less than 10^8 ohm-cm is not found in the references. However a lamination of a high molecular compound is not clearly described and could be interpreted as any polymeric film. Additionally, the metal thin plates are not described by the claims. Examiner has no way of testing materials defined by JIS H 0505 so the materials used in the specification are relied upon for rejecting claims. As applicant has added new claims this rejection is made final.

For convenience the reference is substantially repeated:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 & 9-14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pettigrew et al. US 4,960,651, and further in view of Jin et al. US 7,106,163.

As to Claim 1, Pettigrew et al. '651 discloses magnetic layers (interpreted as two or more) in partial contact (via discrete islands) (Col. 9, Line 47-64) utilizing Fe-Si-B alloys (col. 5, Line 54-59) similar to applicant. Pettigrew et al '651 discloses the magnetic output being dependent on the thickness of the magnetic material but, does not disclose the resistivity of the layered structure. However, Jin et al. '163 discloses a polypropylene thermoplastic (high molecular compound) in contact with a magnetic material and manipulation of permeability by addition of soft magnetic materials (utilizing JIS 0505 resistivity) overlapping applicants resistivity (see figures 3 & 4). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to require a resistivity from 0.1 to 10^8 ohm-cm in the Pettigrew '651 invention in order to control the relative permeability of the core member as taught by Jin et al. 163 (Col. 7, Line 30-56).

As to Claim 2-4, Pettigrew et al. '651 discloses a polymer (applicant's high molecular compound) over a two layer magnetic component being made of an amorphous metal and a stainless steel (Col. 14, Line 22-54) and sectional area magnetic output being dependent on the thickness of the magnetic material (Col. 11, 12, Line 65-68, 1-9 respectively) but, does not disclose resistivity. However, as previously disclosed in claim 1, Jin et al. '163 discloses a polypropylene thermoplastic (high molecular compound) in contact with a magnetic material and manipulation of permeability by addition of soft magnetic materials (utilizing JIS 0505 resistivity) overlapping applicants claim (see figures 3 & 4). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to require a resistivity from 0.1 to 10^8 ohm-cm in the Pettigrew '651

invention in order to control the relative permeability of the core member as taught by Jin et al. 163 (Col. 7, Line 30-56).

As to Claim 5, Pettigrew et al. '651 discloses the use of amorphous metal and silicon steel similar to applicant (Col. 5, Line 23-45).

With respect to claims 9-12, the intended use of the instantly claimed apparatus is noted, however, the intended use does not patentably distinguish said claimed apparatus over prior art. The intended use of the claims does not structurally limit the apparatus. In addition, the prior art apparatus is capable of performing the desired function.

As to Claim 13, Pettigrew et al. '651 discloses the high molecular compound (polymer film) over a two layer magnetic component being made of an amorphous metal and a stainless steel (Col. 14, Line 22-54) and sectional area magnetic output being dependent on the thickness of the magnetic material (Col. 11, 12, Line 65-68, 1-9 respectively) but does not disclose the polymer being utilized. However, Jin '163 discloses the use of resins such as polyester and thermosetting resins such as silicone resin (silicon containing resin) or any mixture that would be a favorable insulating material (Col. 5, Line 13-27). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to utilize a polyester, a thermosetting and/or silicon containing material in order to optimize insulating material properties.

As to Claim 14, Pettigrew et al. '651 discloses the high molecular compound (polymer film) over a two layer magnetic component being made of an amorphous metal and a stainless steel (Col. 14, Line 22-54) and sectional area magnetic output being dependent on the thickness of the magnetic material (Col. 11, 12, Line 65-68, 1-9 respectively) but does not disclose the polymer being utilized. Jin '163 discloses the use of a polyphenylene sulfide (PPS) which examiner interprets as being a sulfone containing resin for insulating properties (Col. 12, Line 12-19). It would have been obvious to use a sulfone containing resin in order to enhance insulating properties.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GARY D. HARRIS whose telephone number is (571)272-6508. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM - 5PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Keith D. Hendricks can be reached on 571-272-1401. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Gary D. Harris/
Examiner, Art Unit 1794

/Holly Rickman/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794

Application Number**Application/Control No.**

10/573,707

Examiner

GARY D. HARRIS

**Applicant(s)/Patent under
Reexamination**

YOSHIDA ET AL.

Art Unit

1794